

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated June 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1, 5-7, 9-12, and 15-26 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 10, and 16 are independent. In the Office Action dated June 13, 2007, Claims 1, 5-7, 9-12, and 15-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1, 5-7, 9-12, and 15-26 remain in this application. Applicant hereby addresses the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Objection to the Claims

In the Office Action dated June 13, 2007, the Examiner objected to Claim 24 as containing various informalities. The second instance of Claim 24 has been renumbered to Claim 26 as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes this objection and adds no new matter.

II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 5-7, 9-12, and 15-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,415,019 ("Savaglio") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,480,592 ("Urban") further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,783 ("Brickman") further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,671,272 ("Vazin") further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,327,357 ("Meek") and further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0016233 ("Charpentier"). Claims 1, 10, and 16 have been amended, and

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, “determining if the called device comprises at least one of a standard caller ID device and a computer terminal; when the called device comprises a standard caller ID device, determining a number of characters displayable on the caller ID device; adapting, based on the determined number of characters displayable on the display on the called device, the location information to fit in a display of the caller ID device; when the called device comprises a computer terminal, employing geographic informational system software to provide detailed routing information to the location of the calling party.” Amended Claims 10 and 16 each includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 8, lines 10-16.

Consistent with embodiments of the invention, a called party may employ a standard caller ID device to display a location ID information. (See specification page 8, lines 10-11.) The standard caller ID device may display a 9-digit zip code location ID data or planar coordinate data. (See specification page 8, lines 11-12.) The zip code location ID data or planar coordinate data may be delivered to the called party for display within limited character spaces available as if it were caller ID data. (See specification page 8, lines 12-13.)

Consistent with embodiments of the invention, the called party may employ a more sophisticated display device, such as a computer terminal, that may be capable of displaying many more characters than the standard caller ID display device. (See

specification page 8, lines 13-15.) The called party's computer terminal may employ geographic informational system (GIS) software or an equivalent to provide more detail about the calling party's location. (See specification page 8, lines 17-19.) For example, the GIS software may operate upon the location information that is received through the location ID service to map the calling party's location. (See specification page 8, lines 19-21.)

In contrast, *Savaglio* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from Claim 1. For example, *Savaglio* merely discloses that a dialing telephone number is determined. (See col. 2, lines 45-46.) For instance, in *Savaglio*, a 911 call is placed over an associated outgoing telephone line. (See col. 2, lines 47-49.) The 911 call is received at a service switching point (SSP). (See col. 2, lines 49-50.) The 911 call in *Savaglio* is triggered "on" and the SSP sends a query to a switching control point (SCP). (See col. 2, lines 50-51.) A response is received that includes a routine instruction. (See col. 2, lines 51-52.) In *Savaglio*, the routing instructions are used to route the 911 call to a public safety answering point (PSAP) and the 911 call is forwarded to an operator. (See col. 2, lines 54-57.) Consequently, *Savaglio* merely discloses providing instructions for routing a 911 call to a PSAP. Accordingly, *Savaglio* at least does not disclose providing detailed routing information to a calling party's location. Rather, *Savaglio* discloses routing a 911 call to a PSAP and is silent regarding instructions on how to get to the calling party's location.

In addition, *Urban* does not overcome *Savaglio*'s deficiencies. *Urban* merely discloses providing a calling party's state name. In *Urban*, when a called party's SSP 50 attempts to terminate a call, SSP 50 triggers a query to an SCP 42 via an STP 44.

(See. Col. 3, lines 4-5.) In particular, *Urban*'s SSP 50 sends a triggered query over a signaling network via STP 44 to SCP 42 as it would send a network signaling protocol 60. (See. Col. 3, lines 5-8.) Like *Savaglio*, *Urban* at least does not disclose providing detailed routing information to a calling party's location. Rather, *Savaglio* discloses providing a calling party's state and is silent regarding instructions on how to get to the calling party's location.

Furthermore, *Brickman* does not overcome *Savaglio*'s and *Urban*'s deficiencies. *Brickman* merely discloses a computer implemented medical integrated decision support system. (See Abstract.) Like *Savaglio* and *Urban*, *Brickman* at least does not disclose providing detailed routing information to a calling party's location. This is because *Brickman* is completely silent regarding providing detailed routing information to a calling party's location.

Moreover, *Vaziri* does not overcome *Savaglio*'s, *Urban*'s, and *Brickman*'s deficiencies. *Vaziri* merely discloses an internet switch box including systems and methods for internet telephony. (See Abstract.) Like *Savaglio*, *Urban*, and *Brickman*, *Vaziri* at least does not disclose providing detailed routing information to a calling party's location. This is because *Vaziri* is completely silent regarding providing detailed routing information to a calling party's location.

Likewise, *Meek* does not overcome *Savaglio*'s, *Urban*'s, *Brickman*'s and *Vaziri*'s deficiencies. *Meek* merely discloses a database for a telecommunication service including a first record for a first number having a predetermined NXX, and a second record for a second number having the predetermined NXX. (See Abstract.) Like *Savaglio*, *Urban*, *Brickman*, and *Vaziri*, *Meek* at least does not disclose providing

detailed routing information to a calling party's location. This is because *Meek* is completely silent regarding providing detailed routing information to a calling party's location.

Lastly, *Charpentier* does not overcome *Savaglio*'s, *Urban*'s, *Brickman*'s, *Vaziri*'s and *Meek*'s deficiencies. *Charpentier* merely discloses graphics manipulation according to a computing device on which graphics are to be displayed. (See Abstract.) Like *Savaglio*, *Urban*, *Brickman*, *Vaziri*, and *Meek*, *Charpentier* at least does not disclose providing detailed routing information to a calling party's location. This is because *Charpentier* is completely silent regarding providing detailed routing information to a calling party's location.

Combining *Savaglio* with *Urban*, *Brickman*, *Vaziri*, *Meek*, and *Charpentier* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Savaglio*, *Urban*, *Brickman*, *Vaziri*, *Meek*, and *Charpentier*, either individually or in any reasonable combination, at least do not disclose, "determining if the called device comprises at least one of a standard caller ID device and a computer terminal; when the called device comprises a standard caller ID device, determining a number of characters displayable on the caller ID device; adapting, based on the determined number of characters displayable on the display on the called device, the location information to fit in a display of the caller ID device; when the called device comprises a computer terminal, employing geographic informational system software to provide detailed routing information to the location of the calling party," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 10 and 16 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 10, and 16 each patentably

distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 10, and 16.

Dependent Claims 5-7, 9, 11-12, 15, and 17-26 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 10, and 16, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 10, and 16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 5-7, 9, 11-12, 15, and 17-26.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge
any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date: October 16, 2007

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:ARL:mdc

39262

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE